REMARKS

The above-identified patent application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's Office Action dated December 06, 2006 (herein, the "Office Action"). In that Office Action, Claims 1 – 11, 12 – 18 and 19 – 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0086539A1 to McCalmont, *et al.* (herein "*McCalmont*") in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,778,818 to O'Neil (herein "*O'Neil*").

In response to the Office Action, Applicants hereby amend Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23 and 25, cancels no claims and adds no claims. Therefore, Claims 1 – 27 are currently pending. As set forth more fully below, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

The present invention is directed to a system and method for making available information to participants in a special number call. The claimed embodiments include providing a plurality of data stores, providing at least one respective data key for accessing the information contained in each respective data store and providing communication among the participants in the plurality of data stores. Importantly, a specific call event is identified as a special number call event and an identifier code is generated that uniquely identifies the call event. The identifier code includes an origin indicator being mappable on the at least one respective data key to effect accessing the information. The communications is used to effect cooperation by the identifier code with each respective data store for providing the information to the participants.

Claims 1 through 27 stand rejected under 35 §U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over *McCalmont* in view of *O'Neil*. It is respectfully submitted that neither *McCalmont* nor *O'Neil*, taken individually or together, teach or suggest all of the claim elements in Applicants' independent claims. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1 through 27 are respectfully requested.

In making the rejection of the independent claims (1, 12 and 19), the Examiner relies on *McCalmont* for all of the claim elements except limitations (c) (in claims 1, 12 and 19) and (d) (in claims 1 and 12 this element is part of (c) in claim 19). For purposes of this

Application No. 10/655,971 Atty Docket No. P3806 March 26, 2007 Page 10 of 11

Amendment, these two elements will be referred to herein as "elements (c) and (d)." The Examiner states that elements (c) and (d) specify generating an identifier code for the call event, the identifier code including relational data, the relational data being configured for mapping on the at least one respective data key to effect accessing the information, employing communication to effect cooperation by the identifier code with each respective data store for providing the information to the participants. The Office Action, Page 2, last paragraph to top of Page 3. To supply these missing elements, the Examiner relies on O'Neil.

Applicants agree that *McCalmont* does not teach or suggest elements (c) and (d) of their independent claims. See Applicants' response to First Office Action. Applicants do not agree that *McCalmont* teaches the other elements. For purposes of brevity in this amendment, Applicants will focus on *O'Neil*.

Applicants respectfully submit that *O'Neil* does not teach elements (c) and (d) of the independent claims. *O'Neil* is directed towards a system for gathering telephone numbers of mobile telephones that may be near a mobile telephone that makes a call to 9-1-1. *O'Neil*, Abstract. The Examiner, in making the rejection, cites *O'Neil*, col. 6, line 32 through col. 7, line 32 as teaching elements (c) and (d). In the cited section, *O'Neil* teaches generating a table of telephone numbers of mobile phones within a predetermined geographic radius on request and a "transaction ID", unique to the request, is generated. Col. 7, lines 24 – 27. *O'Neil* does not teach, however, that the transaction ID has any meaning and does not teach a specific method of construction that makes the transaction ID unique; the transaction ID could be a random number. This transaction ID is not the equivalent of Applicants' identifier code as defined in elements (c) and (d).

Applicants specifically claim in all of their independent claims (*i.e.*, claims 1, 12 and 19, as amended) that the identifier code uniquely identifies the special number call event and that the identifier code includes an <u>origin indicator</u> of the special number call event. The origin indicator is defined in the specification as comprising, for example, "a telephone number, a call back number, a geographic indicator such as an ESRK or another similar indicator." Specification, Paragraph [0051]. Thus, Applicants' identifier code, while unique to the call event, can also be used across a plurality of data stores. *O'Neil* does not teach or

Application No. 10/655,971

Atty Docket No. P3806

March 26, 2007 Page 11 of 11

suggest that his transaction ID could be used for any other purpose other than accessing one

data store. For this reason alone, Applicants' independent claims, as amended, are patentable

over the combination of McCalmont and O'Neil.

Applicants' identifier code also differs from O'Neil's transaction ID in another

significant way. Applicants' identifier code can be used after the call event, like O'Neil's

transaction ID, but, more importantly, Applicants' identifier code can be used during the call

event to access a plurality of data stores to provide information for coping with the special

number call. Neither O'Neil nor McCalmont, taken alone or together, teach or suggest this

element of Applicants' independent claims.

Thus, Applicants' independent claims 1, 12 and 19 are patentable over the prior art.

Claims 2-11, 13-18 and 20-27 all depend from their respective allowable

independent claims and are likewise allowable.

The application now appearing to be in form for allowance, early notification of same

is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if

doing so would expedite the resolution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Michael B. Johannesen/

Michael B. Johannesen, Reg. No. 35,557

Intrado

1601 Dry Creek Drive

Longmont, Colorado 80503

Telephone: (630) 430-1502 or

(630) 300-2727

Date: March 26, 2007